

## Message

**From:** Holst, Linda [holst.linda@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 8/10/2015 12:45:36 PM  
**To:** Hammer, Edward [hammer.edward@epa.gov]; Jackson, Peter W. [jackson.peter@epa.gov]; McKim, Krista [mckim.krista@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** Fwd: Follow-up on Action Items from June Joint Evaluation Call

Any additional thoughts regarding MPCA's response?

Linda

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Kessler, Katrina (MPCA)" <katrina.kessler@state.mn.us>  
**Date:** July 31, 2015 at 10:25:27 AM CDT  
**To:** "Holst, Linda (holst.linda@epa.gov)" <holst.linda@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** "Foss, Ann (MPCA)" <ann.foss@state.mn.us>, "Skuta, Glenn (MPCA)" <glenn.skuta@state.mn.us>, "Pfeifer, David (EPA)" <pfeifer.david@epa.gov>, "Lotthammer, Shannon (MPCA)" <shannon.lotthammer@state.mn.us>, "Pfeifer, David (EPA)" <pfeifer.david@epa.gov>, "Hammer, Edward (hammer.edward@epa.gov)" <hammer.edward@epa.gov>, "Jackson, Peter (jackson.peter@epa.gov)" <jackson.peter@epa.gov>, "Bauer, Candice (Bauer.candice@epa.gov)" <Bauer.candice@epa.gov>, "Faulhaber, Kristen (faulhaber.kristen@epa.gov)" <faulhaber.kristen@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Follow-up on Action Items from June Joint Evaluation Call

Hi Linda:

Sorry it has taken me so long to get back to you on this question. As discussed in the June 26 call MPCA is are not doing a lot of metals monitoring as part of our intensive watershed monitoring around the state. However since that phone call I was able to get some additional information from our Mining Sector about where metals monitoring is occurring downstream of NPDES permitted mining facilities. The following is a short description of that monitoring:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Dunka's permit includes monitoring at a downstream surface water station for Cu, Ni, and Zn
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Cliffs Erie's tailings basin permit includes downstream monitoring for Mo
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->ArcelorMittal's permit requires monitoring for Mn and Mo at downstream surface water monitoring locations
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Essar Steel's permit requires monitoring for Fe at a downstream surface water monitoring location
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Utac is monitoring for Fe in several lakes near the tailings basin but they do not receive surface water discharges
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->PolyMet is monitoring in the Embarrass River downstream of Cliffs Erie

In addition to the above there may also be some downstream monitoring in EIS documents for some of these facilities but no one was able to dig it up expeditiously. Finally our partners at the Minnesota DNR are doing some metals monitoring as part of ongoing research. That work is led out of their Lands and Minerals Division, specifically the Mine Water Research Advisory Panel (MWRAP). If you or your colleagues in Chicago want any more information about the above monitoring, the most efficient contact is Ann Foss (cc'ed).

My apologies again for the delayed response!

Kind regards,  
Katrina

---

**From:** Holst, Linda [<mailto:holst.linda@epa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 22, 2015 8:41 AM  
**To:** Skuta, Glenn (MPCA); Kessler, Katrina (MPCA); Lotthammer, Shannon (MPCA)  
**Cc:** Faulhaber, Kristen; Pfeifer, David; Hammer, Edward; Jackson, Peter W.; Bauer, Candice  
**Subject:** Follow-up on Action Items from June Joint Evaluation Call

Good morning! I wanted to follow-up on the action items I noted from our June 26 joint evaluation call. My notes say I had two items.

1. Metals monitoring -- I raised the issue of metals monitoring and what MPCA has done to address our comment on the monitoring strategy. Glenn said MPCA is bracketing major WWTPs by doing upstream and downstream monitoring, including metals, and consulting with the NPDES program each year to discuss whether additional sampling sites should be added, including sites near minor dischargers. Glenn said MPCA isn't adding metals to the intensive monitoring design because you haven't seen metals to be a major problem. I told Glenn I would talk with Ed and Pete and get back to you to see if this is still an issue for us.

We are encouraging all R5 states to collect ion data if they don't already have a statewide dataset to support ion related criteria and metals criteria (metals bioavailability/toxicity can be influenced by ions) development in the future. In the case of MN, that would mean more than at just the pour points because as we have seen with the mining issues, the dilution from the watershed can significantly change the relative concentrations. Additionally, when asked by our NPDES permits program for ambient data near mines, in some cases we haven't been able to find metals/ion data directly below mining discharges. When saying MPCA hasn't seen metals to be a problem based on monitoring data, does that include water chemistry data collected directly below mining discharges?

2. Ammonia/nitrate criteria – During the call, Glenn said MPCA will be pursuing ammonia and nitrate criteria rulemaking at the same time so ammonia is delayed until EPA gets MPCA final nitrate toxicity data. Glenn asked to know when the additional chronic nitrate data will be available since MPCA would prefer to pursue chronic criteria based on chronic data instead of acute to chronic ratios.

Ed has talked with Phil about the nitrate data. The remaining acute data should be getting into a draft manuscript by the Illinois Natural History Survey very soon. The chronic tests to finish the 8 taxa are scheduled to start this Fall.

If you have any questions or want to talk further, please let me know.

Linda Holst | U.S. EPA Region 5, Water Division, Water Quality Branch | 77 West Jackson Blvd., WQ-16J, Chicago, IL 60604 | Ph. (312) 886-6758 | [holst.linda@epa.gov](mailto:holst.linda@epa.gov)